20c JANUARY 29, 1951

PERIODICAL LIBRARY

New Republic

PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN TIME OF CRISIS

By EDWARD S. CORWIN

INFLATION CAN BE STOPPED

AN EDITORIAL

"CULTURE" IN RED CHINA

By LEONARD CONSTANTINE

SINCLAIR LEWIS AND THE AMERICAN DREAM

By GERALD W. JOHNSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT COUNTRY MANUFACTURED MOST OF THE ARMS NOW BEING USED BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS?

At first guess, most people would say Russia. But they'd be wrong. What world power, inadvertently and ironically, supplied the bulk of the weapons now being used against UN troops in Korea? The answer is only one part of the tragedy of diplomacy that went astray.

(Answered on page 6, Jan. 15th issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

WHAT ARE THE REAL FACTORS BEHIND THE FAMOUS TRUMAN "LETTERS"?

Certain elements of the population were delighted with the furor raised in the press when some of Truman's personal letters became public. Others deplored Truman's apparent lack of discretion. Are these letters merely the President's way of "blowing off steam?" Or is there another—more alarming—reason for Truman's unbridled urge to correspond?

(Answered on page 13, Jan. 1st issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR TYDINGS' DEFEAT IN MARYLAND?

A fake composite picture, purporting to show Sen. Tydings conferring with Earl Browder, was an important factor in the campaign which elected Republican John Butler to the Senate last November. An old device, long held in disrepute, this faked photo was the concoction of another member of our law-making body. Who? And how was it done?

(Answered on page 3, Jan. 8th issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

If you are a regular reader of the NEW REPUBLIC you know the answers to these and other critical questions which vitally affect your welfare and your way of life. If not, you'll want to use the coupon below to make certain you don't miss a single issue!

Armed Service Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $4.00 please enter an annual subscription in my name at the special Armed Service rate of $4.00.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

IN FULL .....

..... 1-29-51

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage $1.00 extra.)

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE..... STATE..... 1-29-51

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR JAN. 29, 1951

5 Inflation Can Be Stopped, An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 The War Goes On
7 Peacetime Uses of UN
7 Catholic Censorship
7 Uniforms for All
8 AVC Board Meets
9 Small Business Squeeze
10 Outside America
11 "Culture" in Red China Today, by Leonard Constantine
14 Romance and Mr. Babbitt, by Gerald W. Johnson
15 The President's Power, by Edward S. Corwin
17 Virginia's Black Justice, by Marvin Caplan
18 Harold L. Ickes
19 Books:
19 "Policy for the West," reviewed by Albert Z. Carr
20 Japan's Lost Revolution, by Thomas C. Smith
20 Two of Henry Green's Books, reviewed by Kate Simon
21 Music
22 Movies

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTER: Jean Begeman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1951, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

DUE TO AN understandable reluctance of Senators to listen to each others' speeches the so-called Great Debate was chiefly a succession of sparcely-attended addresses, with the glittering new chamber only a third to a quarter filled. Nevertheless, nationwide discussion cleared the air. Here are highlights. Not a single Senator, not even Taft, formally supported Hoover's isolationist "Gibraltar" proposal. Taft tried to grab foreign affairs leadership of his party—and failed. Taft made a bid to be not only the Taft of his party but the Vandenberg also, to rule the roost on foreign policy as he does on domestic issues. It looked for a time as though he would succeed. He made a resounding speech the very first day, followed it up with one before the Press Club, issued statements and comments. He has the whole Old Guard, the Wherry-Capehart-Millikin Midwest nationalist leadership, behind him.

Taft failed because Senator Lodge, nonchalantly and amiably, took him apart. We have a feeling that this two-hour exchange marked political history. Lodge clearly had GOP internationalists with him. He did as good a job as Vandenberg could have done. From now on Taft knows he must clear party foreign affairs with Lodge. This makes Lodge a power to reckon with. It is just an idea we have, but we think Taft has talked himself out of the GOP Presidential nomination (if he really ever had any chance). By the time this week started it was pretty certain the Senate would sidetrack the Wherry resolution and wait for Eisenhower to report. As usual it was Senator Douglas (D, Ill.) who popped up with the compromise proposal that let everybody retire with honor. That covers the affair save that the tone has been dignified and responsible; instead of joining in a partisan brawl, men have measured up to events.

One Washington statistic tells the whole explosive economic story: for the tenth straight week average wholesale prices have hit a new all-time high. It was this that bounced academic Dr. Valentine, replaced him with business-diplomat Eric Johnston in the price-control hierarchy. Valentine was such an extraordinary misfit that it was fun watching him. He was almost fanatical in opposition to government controls. So naturally he became controller-in-chief. He is the sound, Republican University of Rochester ex-president, you remember, who publicly condemned the FDR-Churchill "four freedoms" because they omitted a freedom for private enterprise. Price control is a job in which if you are unsuccessful, you resign; if you are successful, you make everyone sore. Valentine didn't do anything and wouldn't throw temporary sandbags into the break in the economic dyke because he wanted blueprints of a complete Boulder Dam first. As a controller he was a flop, but we honor him because he was a volunteer at a time of national peril and because, instead of departing with a scorching letter, he wrote one that was dignified and magnanimous.

So unusual for Washington was the Valentine farewell that it brought an answering paean from Truman (no mean letter-writer himself who might well study the present sample).

The US power lobby has held up the St. Lawrence waterway long enough. Hardening anger in Canada against lobby-ridden Congress indicates the Commonwealth will soon go ahead with the project herself on an all-Canadian basis. This seems about the last chance for the USA to cut in on a major natural resource: the electric lamp the lobby has kept dark 30 years.

Taft, in Press Club speech, angrily called on State Department to "release" the armies of Chiang Kai-shek. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State Department says that 100 percent US sea and air coverage would be required for a Chiang invasion and that such a move would be unrealistic anyway. Acheson wants China called an aggressor for moral reasons, but once this is done the same old charges of "appeaser" will be hurled against him when Congressional opponents discover he is against all-out intervention. Incidentally, our chances of holding on in Korea look considerably better. The thought here is that after the Chinese lose enough men, they may change their tone, and strong resistance will then bolster US prestige in Japan and the East generally.

Unless checked in time the new McCarran subcommittee to investigate Communism is going to be worse than the old Dies Committee at its blackest. The seven-man subcommittee, besides the ineffable McCarran himself, includes GOP isolationists Jenner and Watkins, Dixiecrats Eastland (D, Miss.) and Smith (D, N.C.), who just defeated liberal Senator Graham after a disgraceful campaign featuring charges of "subversion." Two mild conservatives, O'Conor (D, Md.) and Ferguson (R, Mich.), complete the picturesque group of inquisitors. McCarran has asked $160,000 for the job. If granted it ought to give each of the seven a million dollars' worth of garish publicity.

Notes: Lack of St. Lawrence power means New England loses two big aluminum plants to the Northwest. . . . The latest Council of Economic Advisers' report lists four main tax loopholes kept open by big lobbies. . . . Plugging loopholes would bring in perhaps $500 million more in taxes. . . . Under the current budget the TVA will be twice its present size in 1952. . . . Big new attempt to deceive gullible people is to point to civilian "economies" as the way out of higher taxes, yet all our civilian expenses now take only 17 cents of each budget dollar. . . . It's now or never for universal military service—which is about as popular with Congress as higher taxes.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Korean Troops

SIR: I have long been an avid reader of the *New Republic* and agree with you in most instances. There are some glaring mistakes in your editorial entitled "The New War in Korea" (the *NR*, December 11), however, which I wish to correct.

I am at present a member of General MacArthur's command in Korea and so have perhaps a better chance to evaluate the situation than you. You say that General MacArthur has at the present time (December 11, 1950) the equivalent of 16 divisions (250,000 to 300,000 men) under his command and that this is equivalent to the number of troops that the Chinese have in Korea. You go on to say that the estimates of Chinese troop strength are probably too high. Both of these statements are misleading.

General MacArthur is charged with the safety of a much larger territory than only Korea. It is necessary to maintain troops in Japan, the Philippines, Guam and other Pacific outposts. I presume that you do not advocate the withdrawal of troops from these locations to meet the situation in Korea. The seven divisions and diverse support units now employed in Korea are therefore the maximum number of troops presently under MacArthur's command that can be sent over here. (You seem to support this contention and contradict yourself toward the end of the same page when you say that "there are no reinforcements *anywhere* that can be sent to Korea.") Furthermore the long supply lines of the Korean campaign tie down a large number of troops in rear areas such as Japan.

Your skepticism about the size of the Chinese armies in Korea is unfounded. In fact, judging from current intelligence reports available to me, the American press does not know of the full strength of the Chinese in Korea!

The recent reverses are not a matter of surprise and lack of intelligence, though AP and UP are not informed of all of G2's information in advance. They are caused by infinite Chinese superiority in numbers!

c/o Postmaster, San Francisco H.L.R.

[Editors' note—Our correspondent appears to have overlooked 10 South Korean divisions and other UN forces equal to two divisions. This would be the equivalent of 19 divisions in total. We used the figure of 16 divisions since three South Korean divisions were either being reorganized or used to maintain internal order at the time.]

A New Subscriber

SIR: First a word of thanks for the work you are doing. In a world of controlled press with a few selfish men dictating what news the great mass of our population shall read, the magnificent job you are doing shines like a beacon out of the night of ignorance and cupidity that covers us "dark as the pit from pole to pole." There are many of us who pray for the continuance of your work toward liberalism and enlightenment.

But admiration without support is not really enough, and besides, I'm sick of not being able to take our library copy home for more considered study, so please enter my subscription for the year 1951. . . .

Portland, Oregon MILTON C. MAPES JR.

No Connection

SIR: The statement in the article "Case History of a Smear" (*NR* December 25), relating to Mr. (Benjamin) Freedman's alleged relationship to this committee, is totally false. He never had any tie-up or connection with this committee; and the statement to that effect by the author of your article is wholly unfounded.

SUMNER GERARD
Trustee and Treasurer, Committee for Constitutional Government
New York City

NR Testimony

SIR: I have read the *New Republic* since it started. It always has been tops—but the 8th of January number seems supreme. It says what should have been shouted at the defeatists long ago—I am not afraid, while we have in our midst people such as Harold Ickes and the Reverend Davies of Washington, D. C. Circumstances, since my retirement as a school teacher from a private school, force me to refrain from too many subscriptions for magazines. I vow the *New Republic* will be mine and passed on, as long as I live. . . .

Portland, Oregon MRS. EDELE REED

Communist China

SIR: I have valued my *NR* subscription for the past six years as a practical necessity, a counter-agent, so to speak. . . . We have particularly enjoyed the articles on Communist China by Leonard Constantine as an objective piece of reporting on the Great Menace. It is refreshing in this time of hysteria to have a publication courageous enough to report some goods which are discernible along with the evils.

Springfield, Vt. K. L. T.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 124, NUMBER 5, ISSUE 1887, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 29, 1951 **New Republic**

INFLATION CAN BE STOPPED

THE GOVERNMENT has finally decided to assume full control of prices. The first steps toward doing so should have been taken when the Korean War began. Food prices today are seven percent higher than last June because those steps were not taken. In the general relief that will be felt because something is being done at last, it is important to remember that price control alone will not stop inflation. Without several kinds of supporting action, price control will merely drive inflation underground.

The accompanying actions that are required will test our national character.

Will we tax ourselves more heavily than ever before in our history—without the moral pressure of a world war?

Will we refuse to tolerate the blackmarkets and illegal profiteering which will appear with the return of price controls and rationing?

Will organized labor accept the need to freeze its standard of living until total production can be expanded enough to permit incomes to rise without pushing inflation ahead? Will workers do so ungrudgingly, keeping their individual outputs high although material incentives are temporarily removed?

Unless the answer to each of these questions is yes, price control will profit us little.

Prices. The greatest need for a freeze in prices is on the scarce materials going into defense production. Speculation in metals, minerals, chemicals and building materials, among other items, has added $3 billion or more to our defense costs since last June (see page 9 this issue). Establishing ceilings on prices of key raw materials and selected textiles is expected to be Eric Johnston's first action as the new Economic Stabilizer. He will also need to establish a government monopoly on the purchase of such materials by import to keep international blackmarkets from springing up.

The President's decision to fire Alan Valentine and adopt a policy of full-scale mandatory controls probably resulted in large part from the loud cries about high prices constituents have been directing toward Capitol Hill.

Department of Agriculture studies show that the food cost for an average consumer for a year has jumped from $211 last June to $227 on December 15. In June, 1946, the average food cost for a year was estimated at about $160. The same amount of food last month cost $227. Mr. Johnston is powerless to set price ceilings on some of the most important items in the family market-basket because of the way the Defense Production Act is drawn. Efforts will now be started to change that law so as to allow flexibility in the parity formula and the granting of certain retail subsidies. A vigorous demonstration of what can and cannot be done to check food prices under the existing law is the best way for Johnston to persuade Congress to agree to those essential amendments. But the main thing for Johnston to do immediately is to make the fullest use of every power to stabilize given under the Production Act and waste no time in waiting for perfecting amendments.

Taxes. The full $16.5 billion gap between federal spending and income should be filled by immediate taxes —because we can afford to pay as we go for defense, and because the payment of fairly apportioned taxes will take money out of circulation which otherwise might swell the demand for scarce consumer goods.

An equitable tax law would: take another $3 to $5 billion per year from corporations, depending upon whether prices continue to rise; collect $5 billion more through excise taxes on durable goods as well as on liquor, tobacco and transportation; levy another $6 billion in individual income taxes, raising the rates both above and below the $5,000 level, closing loopholes in the present law and revoking the community-income provision; $250 to $500 million more could be realized by estate and gift taxes.

Wages. "Consideration should be given to the suggestion," the President's Council of Economic Advisers recommended in its latest report, "that, where some wage adjustments become necessary over the long pull to provide incentives, the increased potential spending power should be diverted from the actual spending stream until inflationary pressures become less serious. Various constructive proposals may be developed to obtain this deferred effect."

Thus far no such "constructive proposals" have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developed, although heated discussions between top government and labor officials are being held on the subject. The best way to compensate labor fairly for increases in production, without running counter to the national interest with regard to inflation, would be to pay all wage increases after price controls go into effect in the form of non-cashable bonds, redeemable only after the emergency.

There is much to commend such a plan from labor's view. The choice is between such a savings system and higher prices or higher taxes. A deferred wage plan is a way to achieve stabilization of the cost of living without sacrificing the hard-won rights to premium pay for overtime and regular raises for increased productivity on the job. Time and a half after 40 hours of work per week and annual wage increases of three percent or more per year, the generally accepted average improvement in productivity, could be allowed without inflationary effect, if labor agreed to take the extra pay in non-cashable bonds.

Labor leaders cannot be expected to urge a deferred wage plan. The suggestion should come from government. Charles E. Wilson, the Production Mobilizer, and Eric Johnston should put this proposal to labor immediately. Given the proper assurances that the government is serious about controlling the cost of living, later on as well as now, the chances are that labor will agree. Such an agreement would create additional support for inflation control, since millions of Americans would have the added incentive of protecting their savings.

It is impractical to think that the harmful effects of inflation can be appreciably "rolled back" at this stage. But inflation can be stopped from advancing further. Price control must be the first step, and it is cause for rejoicing that the decision has finally been made to go ahead with it. The businessman team of Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston expresses itself in favor of sweeping controls on the economy, but consumers naturally will be nervous until these men prove themselves to be on the side of the public, rather than any special, interest.

Inflation cannot be stopped by any simple "soak the rich" formula. Huge profits which are now escaping taxes can and must be tapped to help pay for emergency expenses. But that will not begin to be enough. The chief source of today's inflation is the average American family. Its attitude toward the enforcement of price ceilings and the payment of taxes and its willingness to defer until more normal times the benefits of longer and harder hours worked this year will be the strongest determinants of whether inflation will be checked.

THE WEEK

THE WAR GOES ON

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y. (NR corresp.)

The hope of peace in Korea receded to the dim horizon last week, with Communist China's decisive rejection of the latest UN attempt to bring about a cease-fire. To be sure, the Peking Government did not say a flat no; but it might as well have done so.

The Communists refused to suspend hostilities during the negotiations. They demanded a seat in the UN from the moment these negotiations were under way. All American forces were to be withdrawn in advance from Formosa and adjacent areas and all foreign troops to be withdrawn from Korea (whether this would include Chinese "volunteers" was not clear). The conference was to take place in China itself, and the countries to participate were specified—Communist China, Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, Egypt and India.

While it is always dangerous to try to read the minds of people with a culture so alien to our own, it is hard not to believe that these terms were deliberately made unacceptable, on the theory that the longer the fighting in Korea goes on, the better China's bargaining position. It is probably no coincidence that simultaneously there came unverified reports from the Far East that Russia had sent large numbers of troops to China, or to other areas, including the Kurile Islands, where they could be employed in a general war. Putting on the heat in this way is an old Communist device.

It should be no surprise to anyone that even now, many members of the UN are still reluctant to abandon all hope of a peaceful settlement and begin to take those retaliatory measures against China, outside Korea, which could so easily turn into a full-scale conflict and then into the third world war for which the non-Communist world is so badly prepared. India is the spearhead for this group, actuated triply by desire for peace, fear that a general war now would result in a democratic defeat, and strong surviving remnants of sentiment for "Asia and the Asiatics." These ideas are shared, in varying degrees and for varying reasons, by many delegations to the UN. The United States recognized this feeling even in our first vigorous demand last week that Communist China now be formally branded an aggressor. We did so by carefully leaving the door open for future negotiation with some United Nations group, to be set up for that purpose, if the Communists should change their minds. At the end of the week, most of the UN delegations were feverishly seeking fresh instructions from their governments, conscious that what is done in the next few weeks may determine the history of this planet for many years to come.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PEACETIME USES OF UN

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y. (NR corresp.)

Although public attention is almost entirely concentrated nowadays on efforts of the United Nations to end the war in Korea, this is by no means the only important activity in which the UN is engaged. An enormous mass of peacetime enterprises are now going forward under UN auspices. Here, for example, are a few from the past week or two, selected more or less at random:

1. The UN Genocide Convention has now come into force, having been ratified by 37 nations. The Convention makes it a crime under international law to murder people wholesale because of race or religion. Unhappily, the nations which have ratified do not include the United States, whose Congress has not yet been able to find time for this action.

2. The UN is beginning a world-wide attack on crime, taking over the activities formerly handled by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

3. A Committee on Freedom of Information, with delegates from 15 nations, is at work seeking to prepare a convention to help offset the world-wide tendency toward censorship, which reaches its worst excesses in the totalitarian countries.

4. The UN Special Committee on the Balkans has issued a report denying that Greece is a threat to Albania and Bulgaria. This has been a favorite allegation of propaganda in the Russian satellite countries.

5. The UN Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East is meeting in New Delhi to discuss flood-control problems, which destroy millions of acres of food crops annually in India alone.

6. The UN Central Opium Board is working on the problem of revising the international opium convention. This convention, written in 1925, does not cover the new synthetic drugs, which have become a serious problem.

7. The US has asked the UN Economic and Social Council to study the world-wide problem of the conservation of water, in view of the fact that shortages of water are beginning to show up in many parts of the world.

8. Requests are now coming in from all over the world to the UN for assistance in numerous technical problems in such fields as public health, electric power, conservation, agriculture, education, etc. These requests are now being considered by the UN Technical Assistance Board, which is sorting them out as to urgency and the possibility of aid with the funds and personnel now available.

The foregoing are, of course, only the barest sampling of what is being done. If we include a list of the activities of such groups as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, even for the past few months, we could fill up most of this issue of the *NR*.

CATHOLIC CENSORSHIP

The attempt of the Catholic Church to prevent the citizens of New York City from seeing Roberto Rossellini's "The Miracle" is developing into one of the biggest censorship battles of recent years. Cardinal Spellman is on one side; some 80 or more writers, publishers, lawyers, educators and non-Catholic clergymen have up to now publicly stated that they are on the other.

As matters now stand, the American ditributors of the film, included in the trilogy, "Ways of Love," have been ordered to appear before the Board of Regents on January 30 to "show cause" why the picture is not sacrilegious and why its license should not be revoked. This same board originally approved the picture and its decision was upheld by Supreme Court Justice Aroon Steuer when New York City Commissioner of Licenses Edward T. McCaffrey, acting as a self-appointed guardian of public morality, tried to ban "The Miracle."

The point at issue is the basic one of whether or not the authority of the Catholic Church shall extend beyond its communicants. It is not a new issue, but it comes up here in unusually clear form.

In his statement of January 7, forbidding all good Catholics to see "The Miracle," the Cardinal made the significant statement that if the laws of New York State cannot be interpreted to ban such pictures, the people must see to it that the laws are changed. In other words, if movies can be shown against the best judgment of Cardinal Spellman, we must plug the loophole that permits this shocking affront to clerical omnipotence.

The Cardinal remarked further, somewhat incautiously, that the United States is a "religious nation." So it is, and some 27 Protestant clergymen have to date urged the Board of Regents to stand to its guns against the Catholic fire. What the United States is not, as yet, is a theocratic state, and the meeting on January 30 may just possibly prove that it is not likely to become one.

UNIFORMS FOR ALL

The Defense Department has presented Congress with a bill establishing America's first Universal Military Service program which will make uniformed duty a certainty for all young men except the badly disabled and mentally incompetent. It calls for transforming the present loose *selective* service into a long-term system of definite obligation, scheduled periods of service and planned build-up of the country's active and reserve military forces.

As Defense Secretary George Marshall presented the plan, all young men as they become 18 would be sent into initial training lasting four months, after which their qualifications would determine whether they would be assigned to combat, technical or non-combatant duty for the remainder of a 27-month "hitch." According to Secretary Marshall's manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, only an estimated 80,000 out of each class of over one million would be sufficiently unfit to escape service. A very limited number of promising students would be allowed to defer their military duty until they complete their education.

For the five years since the war, wavering public opinion has deterred Congress from decisive action on Universal Military Service. Now there seems to be widespread support for a UMS program. But the hearings being held by the Sen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ate Armed Services Committee reflect the general confusion about the country's mobilization aims. Senators have been receiving piles of mail from reservists and others who think they have been given raw deals by the military; and Senators are insisting that the Defense Department present detailed plans for correcting individual injustices in the future. As the debate continues every young voter-to-be and his mother are likely to let his Congressman know of his interest in the matter. The knowledge that they are committed in advance on the basic issue is likely to make Congressmen settle with all the more vengeance on the more malleable details—as the educators, the women's clubs and the clergy exert pressure which will be at best at cross-purposes with the armed forces' all too evident need for men.

Specific points which are already hot issues are Secretary Marshall's request for power to induct 18-year-olds, and to lengthen the term of service from the present 21 to 27 months. Mrs. Rosenberg and her aides argue that it is socially less disturbing to take young men at 18, and cheaper and more efficient, as well as necessary, for them to serve at least two years. General Marshall states: "I feel certain that the young men of 18 who come into the services would learn much to make them sturdier and better citizens." The opponents of the "take them out of high school" approach cite the testimony of World War II training officers who in many cases found younger boys lacking in maturity for their required work. Others would rather take 18-year-olds but reduce the term of service, and argue with Sen. Wayne Morse (R, Oreg.) that, "the American people don't have the right to penalize these boys with the added six months just to save some money."

In the normal parliamentary process, it is likely there will be a compromise about who is to be taken into the Army and when. Reasonable answers to other complex dilemmas have already been worked out by the drafters of the UMS bill specifically in the educational provisions which integrate the country's immediate defense needs and its long-term requirement for educated leaders and specialists.

The UMS bill provides for the annual deferment of 75,000 promising students, an increase in Reserve Officer Training Programs to annual classes of over 60,000, and short periods of special training at universities for an additional 50,000 students. This would cut present male classes of 300,000 by at least 40 percent, but educators have resigned themselves to the difficult future this implies for them. At its recent meeting, the 650 members of the Association of American Colleges voted unanimously to support a UMS program, although only a year ago polls showed educators opposed by more than five to one. Educators, however, will urge reconsideration of the 18-year-olds' position, and pre-selection of students eligible for deferment well in advance, to prevent emptying the classrooms while selections are being made.

HERBLOCK IN THE WASHINGTON POST

"And sometimes I think even thee are Socialistic"

The Chiefs of Staff's initial indecision on how large a force to ask for resulted in a lack of clarity in parts of Mrs. Rosenberg's presentation to the Armed Services Committee. But Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey later told the committee that if they did not take 18-year-olds, veterans or older family men would have to be drafted, as UMS alternatives are limited by simple mathematics.

AVC BOARD MEETS

The national leaders of the American Veterans Committee, at a recent meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., considered at length numerous reports of discrimination and segregation in the Army. The National Planning Committee of the AVC pointed out that on September 30, 1949, President Truman ordered integration of all white and Negro troops in the armed forces. The Navy and Air Force have carried out the order, but the Army has failed to do so.

The NPC cited recent reports of racial segregation of inductees and charged that "the Army is in fact spreading and extending the racial doctrines which furnish propaganda fuel for our enemies at home and abroad." Although basic training in the Army is apparently conducted on both a segregated and non-segregated basis, the NPC said, unit activation follows the customary "Jim Crow policy which was the source of difficulty, confusion and disgrace in World War II."

"The Army's practices permit only the conclusion that the Chief of Staff of the US Army has either wilfully or negligently failed to carry out the directive of the Commander-in-Chief [President Truman]," the NPC charged. In a resolution, the board urged the President to reiterate his integration order and demand that the policy be carried out. "In the event that the Army fails to carry out this directive, we respectfully suggest to the Commander-in-Chief that all responsible officers . . . be court-martialled for violation of the Articles of War, as have been other officers and enlisted men where their derelictions were neither so gross nor so damaging to the military establishment of the United States," the resolution concluded.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The committee also called upon the 82nd Congress to extend to veterans of the Korean conflict "benefits fully equivalent to those granted veterans of World War II," such as National Service Life Insurance, education benefits, compensations for wartime injuries and allowances granted to dependents of members of the armed forces.

In separate resolutions the NPC denounced US Veterans Administrator Carl R. Gray's firing of the VA Medical Director, Paul B. Magnuson, and condemned Gray's action in committing an expenditure of $500,000 for a survey of the VA, repeating work previously done by the Hoover Commission.

The AVC's board gave Secretary of State Acheson a vote of confidence and asked either Truman or Acheson to visit India and Southeast Asia to give a personal pledge of our friendship.

SMALL BUSINESS SQUEEZE

Twice within the last 10 years the life of small business has been jeopardized by an all-out industrial mobilization program. The Senate Small Business Committee, in a comprehensive report, revealed last week that because of growing inflation and increasing scarcity of materials "small companies in all sections of the country are calculating the life expectancy of their organizations in terms of weeks."

To small business it seems as though the lessons learned during the early phases of World War II have been forgotten. The economic casualty lists then were made up of small enterprises. In the first two years of the last war, 16 percent of the small businessmen of the country were forced to close their doors, primarily because "a lion's share" of war contracts was funneled to big business. From 1940 through 1944, the 100 largest US corporations got 60.6 percent of all prime defense and war contracts awarded. More than 51 percent of such contracts went to the top 33 companies. "And while the order backlogs of this handful of companies were growing daily, and critical weapons shortages were developing on some fighting fronts," the committee report said, "the productive facilities of many of our 184,000 manufacturing establishments were idle."

The Senate committee warns that in the rush of the present mobilization we are making the same mistakes. Although small business managed to survive the last war and early in 1950 reached a new production peak, since July the small manufacturer has been caught between the soaring costs of doing business and the acute scarcity of essential production materials. "Nor are these small producers reassured when they see military procurement officers, in understandable haste to award defense contracts, take some of the very short-cuts which were partly responsible for the exclusion of small bidders in the early years of the last war," the committee said. Small businessmen find little comfort in the knowledge that, since the declaration of a state of national emergency on December 18, some 70 percent of all military procurement has been conducted on a "negotiated" basis while only about two-fifths of the remaining 30 percent of purchases is being awarded to the general small bidder on an "advertised" basis.

Even the small companies that have been granted defense contracts are losing money because of the rising costs of materials. The committee report estimated that "soaring prices alone" have boosted defense costs $3 billion since the outbreak of the Korean War. The report cited price increases of 133 percent for natural rubber, 83 percent for tin, 67 percent for wool, 48 percent for lead, 16 percent for zinc and 12 percent for steel. "Gray market operators are out to make a quick killing," the committee said, and reported that large tonnages of sheet steel are currently being offered in New York at $350 a ton, about $225 a ton higher than is legitimate. Steel mills have increased shipments to their own fabricating subsidiaries at the expense of small customers and have reduced the amount of steel for general consumption by upping shipments to their own warehouses.

The committee urges immediate production controls to direct the flow of supplies and materials and insists that the "executors of our national defense policies and programs must decide what role shall be assigned to the 3.6 million small businesses which form the broad base of our industrial-commercial pyramid."

A fortnight ago, small business received a setback when the Supreme Court ruled that a business firm can sell its goods at a lower price to one customer than it does to another provided it is acting in "good faith" to meet competition. The Federal Trade Commission had challenged the right of Standard Oil of Indiana, under the Robinson-Patman Act, to sell gasoline to four comparatively large "jobber" customers in Detroit at a lower price than it sold to many comparatively small service-station customers in the same area. The "jobber" customers could resell gasoline at retail below the prevailing rates of nearby service stations. The FTC found that such reduced resale prices "have resulted in injuring, destroying, and preventing competition" between the favored dealers and retail dealers.

There was an unusual line-up in the five-to-three decision. Justice Burton's majority opinion was joined by Justices Clark, Frankfurter, Douglas and Jackson. Justice Reed who wrote the dissent was joined by Chief Justice Vinson and Justice Black. Justice Minton, who wrote a brilliant opinion upholding the FTC, now reversed by the Supreme Court, when he was on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in 1949, did not participate in the decision.

The dissenting Justices charged that the court's interpretation leaves what the seller can do almost as "wide open" as before the Robinson-Patman Act. This action, Reed said, "would permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers. . . ."

Standard Oil, the majority said, presented evidence to prove that its tank-car price was made to each "jobber" in order to retain him as a customer and in "good faith" to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor.

Certainly the decision gives large business more freedom to use price discrimination against small business. And it lessens the power of the FTC which has a host of other similar price-discrimination cases pending.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

The Astoria Hotel in Paris was for a number of simple, practical reasons the best site for General Eisenhower's temporary headquarters. It was a convenient base for the General's preliminary tours of study and inspection. It left him neutral and uncommitted as between the advice of those who want the permanent headquarters to be in Versailles or Fontainebleau and the appeals of the advocates of Frankfurt or a West German city even closer to the Soviet zone. The building was large enough, already equipped to house a military establishment, and also available for quick occupancy because the American Graves Maintenance Command which has been using it is being transferred to another French city.

But the French Communists are working hard to spread the tale that Eisenhower chose the place precisely because it was the headquarters of the German Wehrmacht during the war. For those who gag at such a story, the version is that the Americans are grossly insensitive to the feelings of the Parisians, and that their willingness to put material convenience above all considerations of humanity and morality is inevitably making them walk in the footsteps of the German militarists.

Both versions are part of the Kremlin's new tactics in France, worked out at a recent meeting in Moscow attended by Maurice Thorez, Palmiro Togliatti and Communist leaders from all the Western European countries as well as from Germany and the satellites. The basis of the tactics is to foment and exploit fear and hatred of the Germans as a means of splitting large sections of French public opinion away from official support of rearmament of the Atlantic Community.

The "line" in France is somewhere between new "hard" tactics, to be put into effect in England, and new "soft" tactics ordered for Germany and Italy. The Political Bureau of the CP, Great Britain, according to the London *Observer*, has issued a manifesto instructing all members to cause unrest on "war production [which] means, in practice, all industrial production." The directive was prefaced with the declaration that "this is the most serious call the Communist Party has sent out since the end of the war." The leverage is fomentation and exploitation of workers' discontent in five major industries—engineering, railways, building, mining and the docks. But the equivalent of French public opinion's doubts about American policy in Germany and Spain is in England the very widespread popular feeling that American policy in Korea and Formosa is dragging Britain where it really does not want to go and should not go. This is used as a lever.

In Germany, the local tactics are also based upon exploiting popular feeling that already exists, especially anti-American and anti-war feeling. The "line" is to give or foster concessions that will feed the hope of all-Germany unity, without either rearmament or the danger of war. The formula is: Germany united, independent, free—not once more destroyed.

In Italy, the Communist approach is similarly conciliatory. Although the top man of the party, Luigi Longo, is notoriously the leader of the tough faction, he has come out in favor of renewal of the efforts—without and despite America, of course—to get the nation into the UN. This, he says, is now possible; the statement has been taken as a hint that the Soviet Union would not again use its veto. The Italian "Peace Partisans Committee" summoned members of Parliament of all parties to make a peace effort "above all party prejudices and divisions, and all political quarrels." The accompanying whispering campaign is based upon the formula —carefully planted—that America is embarking upon "precisely the ultranationalism of which Italy thought it was finally curing itself."

While these new tactical variants of the peace offensive are being used in Germany and Western Europe, the Kremlin is hastening the building up of Europe's military equivalent of the North Koreans—the satellite armies. Marshal Tito's military intelligence service estimates that the Rumanian Army has been built up to 300,000 men; the Bulgarian army, to 195,000; the Hungarian, to 165,000. The figures are close to the ones gathered by the French General Staff. With armed secret police and frontier guards, the total is something like 1.1 million men.

Americans in Europe suggest the Soviets would not dare use these satellite armies for fear that whole units, perhaps entire divisions, would desert or at least prove unreliable. The French dismiss the idea as no better than the American military theory, in the summer of 1941, that the Soviet armies would crumble.

On the other hand, both French and British intelligence services believe that while the Soviets are exploiting the political stresses increased by the rearmament policy and program in the Western European countries, they are having troubles of their own behind the Iron Curtain. High-pressure industrial mobilization is not being carried out as smoothly as is the strengthening of the satellites' standing armies. While the British Communist Party is trying to use miners' grievances against successfully stepped-up industrial production, Moscow is forced to face the fact of growing discontent among Polish, Czech and Hungarian miners. And the "soft" line toward Germany is causing serious complaints in Czechoslovakia that the Germans are being given "national" benefits at the expense of Czech "national" benefits.

There are, therefore, currents of opinion in the French and British political intelligence services which favor some relenting of the consistently "hard" line of American policy on Germany. The view is that the longer Washington postpones any final calculated risk, the greater chance will there be for development of the divisive political and economic conflicts between Germany and the satellites, and among the satellites.

PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"CULTURE" IN RED CHINA TODAY

by Leonard Constantine

ONE OF THE most vivid impressions of Communist rule in China is the amazing power of its propaganda. Past masters at the art, the Communists can make the people believe and do anything—and without using the terrorist methods of the Kuomintang, who could never enforce their orders, even with the aid of the concentration camp and firing squad.

Communist propaganda takes the form of a few simple, elementary statements, repeated again and again. This repetition is most important, for it is based on a conviction that people will believe anything if they hear it often enough. This has been proved true. The statement to be accepted is first laughed at as absurd, then it becomes familiar; perhaps there is something in it after all or it would not be repeated so often, and finally it becomes accepted as true.

A striking example of this is the statement that Russia, not America, defeated Japan in 1945. At first it was treated with ridicule; most Chinese had firsthand knowledge of the American war effort. Then they began to think that perhaps part of the truth had been kept from them, and soon educated men who ought to know better were taking it as an accepted fact that the Russian armies caused the surrender of Japan.

The power of propaganda was used most effectively to help to stabilize the currency. After years of inflation and the complete collapse first of national currency and then the much boosted "gold yuan," faith in paper currency completely disappeared, and silver dollars became the only medium of exchange. The Kuomintang tried desperately to stamp out dealings in silver, even going to the length of publicly executing those found using it. It made not the slightest difference. When the Communists took over, silver dollars were in general circulation, and no one had faith in the new Communist currency—the People's Notes. To establish confidence in their own currency and recall the silver was their first major task; and they won a complete victory. It was a vindication of their propaganda methods; and they showed their astuteness in never going too far in advance of public opinion. At each stage they knew just how much the people would stand.

The aim of propaganda is to condition the mind, to change the thoughts of the people. Marxism-Leninism is stated in its simplest form as a series of axioms which need no explanation. Everything is black or white. Even university teachers are treated as children, and the textbook studied by all classes of people, "The History of Social Development," is of primary-school standard, a very brief exposition of the class struggle in history. Little attempt is made to treat Marxism at any deeper level. Propaganda paints a picture of England and America tottering on the verge of economic collapse with millions starving, contrasted with the wonderful conditions in Russia where all enjoy the good things of life.

The claim is constantly made that the peoples of the world are on the side of Communism and only the reactionary governments are their enemy. Often a tortuous line has to be followed to make the facts square with this thesis. The British general election of 1950 provided an interesting example. The newspapers had to explain how it was that not a single Communist had been elected to Parliament, if the British workers were on the Communist side. This they did to their own complete satisfaction. First it was pointed out that every candidate has to pay a deposit of $420, six months' wages for a worker; therefore, working men were precluded from standing for Parliament. Then the polling was not secret, since every ballot is numbered, so the government can find out how people voted. Further, the candidates' party is not given on the ballot; many people wanted to vote for the Communist but did not know which he was. Thus the Communist debacle was explained.

The press as an instrument of propaganda makes a fascinating study. Overnight, newspapers changed their complexion: Kuomintang papers became official party organs under new names, while independent papers became exact replicas of the Communist ones. A new world was revealed. News of England or America gave place to long articles on Russia and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe. A Chinese finds it very hard to take an interest in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria, but that is all he can read about.

The papers are deadly serious and the reader would look in vain for pictures of glamour girls, for crime and sex stories or political gossip; he finds instead stories on labor-union activities, factory production and the end-

---

This is the fourth of a series of articles on life inside Communist China. The fifth and last will discuss manners and morals, the family and the possibility of successful anti-Communist propaganda.

The author, who left China recently, taught history for nearly 20 years at Huachang University at Wuchang.

These articles are published by arrangement with the Manchester "Guardian" and the Baltimore "Sun."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less government plans for economic reconstruction. Newspapers, too, engage in the orgy of self-confession for their errors, and not merely the conventional "the editor regrets." By a slip of the pen or compositor's error, the phrase "Russian imperialism" occurred in a Communist daily, instead of "American imperialism." The apologies for that one had to be very profuse.

Letters to the editor are a new feature of the papers, which never appeared under the Kuomintang. Readers are encouraged to write their criticisms of government administration, of public officials and services. Such criticisms are now very popular; students, even from primary school, write to denounce their teachers; doctors are attacked for their treatment of patients in hospitals; public officials are accused of bureaucracy.

The new type of newspaper was at first deeply resented. "There's no news in the papers any more; they're not worth reading," was the usual comment. But since there was nothing else to read, people had to scan them for what crumbs of news they could find. Gradually the old style of paper was forgotten, and the people became conditioned to those which are entirely instruments of propaganda and indoctrination.

So sure are the Communists of the power of their methods that they are willing to use and re-train the officials of the old order. The civil service and police were taken over completely, only the top officials of the Kuomintang running away, and are being conditioned to become loyal servants of the Communist state. It is interesting to watch the stamp of the hard, mechanical, bureaucratic Communist official being imposed on them: officials of the Aliens' Bureau who had maintained cordial relations with foreigners have now assumed the formal, correct, unbending attitude of their Communist overlords.

Will this propaganda succeed? Older people know that much of it is false and treat it with scorn. Totalitarian propaganda by its very exclusiveness creates a reaction—the desire to listen to the other side. Before liberation it was the smart thing to listen secretly to the Communist radio; since liberation many of the same people listen secretly to Formosa or the "Voice of America." What is forbidden becomes attractive; rumor takes the place of news and circulates the most fantastic stories of victories by the Kuomintang and its early return to power. Puns and jokes about the Communists, many of them witty plays on the Chinese ideograph, are whispered from mouth to mouth. But propaganda does succeed entirely among children and students. Since it is pounded into them from primary school upward, it only needs a short time for new generations to arise who have known nothing else.

Is there an iron curtain in China, or only a bamboo one with many cracks through which the outside world may be seen? For Communist propaganda to be successful an iron curtain is a necessity; there must be no opportunity of hearing the other side. The bamboo curtain is becoming stronger and the cracks are gradually being filled in. There has been no interference with radio reception, and foreign periodicals are freely allowed. But this is a small matter, for few Chinese own short-wave radios or read foreign magazines. Though there is no outward evidence of censorship, letters to and from China are opened and read; and no one dares freely express his opinions in a letter.

Foreign travel for Chinese has come almost to a standstill. It is impossible to obtain permission to go abroad, except for those who go as official delegates. Personal contacts between China and the West will come to an end, to the great loss of both sides.

In considering the iron curtain, Hongkong forms a special problem. While it remains in British hands there is still a window on the Western world. Thousands of Chinese cross the border daily and immediately enter a new world, where they can again be corrupted by capitalism, again hear all opinions. Of all the Chinese people, the Cantonese are proving the most recalcitrant; and they are in closest contact with Hongkong. Sooner or later it will be necessary for the Communists to close this gap and take over the government of Hongkong either by agreement with the British or by force.

Education for the masses. The aims of the People's Government are seen most clearly in its educational policy. While in other spheres a pretense is made of passing through a transition stage toward Communism, in education a thorough-going policy of indoctrination is being carried out. After liberation, schools and universities were ordered to carry on as usual, but in practice this proved impossible. The wine of liberation went to the students' heads; for a time they were completely out of hand; liberation for them meant no work, no examinations, freedom from all discipline and control of university administration. In most universities the president found it expedient to resign, and, as few individuals were willing to accept such a thankless job, his place was usually taken by a committee. At first there was a feeling of relief that there was so little governmental interference, especially with the Christian universities, but step by step the government has unfolded its policy until it has become evident that all education must become Communistic.

The first step toward the new system was to establish short-term revolutionary universities where intensive training is given for four months in political subjects.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These were set up in every newly-liberated area. They were housed in borrowed buildings, usually belonging to a Christian organization. The students are given food, clothing and pocket money; and no academic qualifications for entrance are necessary. No books are used, instruction consisting of lectures each morning three hours in length, followed by small groups where arguments are thrashed out, and conclusions are brought to an evening meeting for correction and correlation. The subject matter is the history of social development —a very elementary review of history as the history of the class struggle and of current events, consisting mainly of fulminations against American imperialism. Every four months thousands of students are graduated from the revolutionary universities and are assigned to posts by the government. These institutions, however, are purely temporary, to fill the gap until thorough political training can be given in all existing schools.

The first step in reforming the old universities was to order them to admit a percentage of workers and soldiers, even though these fail to pass the entrance examinations. In the first year after liberation, emphasis has been on political training, and all teachers and students have been required to spend at least 10 hours a week in political study. Compulsory courses are now required in the New Democracy—dialectical materialism and political economy. Most teachers are afraid to give these courses, for fear of deviating from the party line, but when the universities asked the Communist Party to provide teachers they were told it had not enough trained men and they must do the best they could.

The teaching of English has been drastically reduced. Russian is taught as an alternative language, and all books in English must be discarded as quickly as possible. In middle schools no second language is now taught in the first three years; then either English or Russian may be selected, but very few hours are given to it. In only a year or two, university students will be able to use no other language than Chinese.

The aim of curriculum revision is described as "concentration and simplification"—that is, cutting out the frills and teaching the bare essentials in each subject. Many of these reforms are good; the cramming and multiplication of courses under the old system are being abolished. But every subject must be taught from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. In science it is emphasized that there is no such thing as pure science; there is only capitalist science and proletarian science. It is argued that all culture has a class basis, and that the new education must break away from the British and American tradition which is part of the capitalist system.

The urgent task is to change the thoughts of the teachers, and this is being carried out with great vigor. The government is making strenuous efforts to win the support of the intellectuals, but it regards them as politically the most unreliable class, stained with the thoughts and habits of the bourgeoisie, which will take a long time to eradicate. So they must be subject to constant control, criticism and indoctrination.

In administration, the main change is that students are represented on all bodies, from the faculty meeting to the senate or university council. They take part in deciding the appointment, promotion and dismissal of teachers, in drawing up the budget, and in determining curriculum. Though in theory the student representatives could easily be outvoted, in fact nothing can be done which meets with their disapproval, for to flout the students' wishes is undemocratic. The government is now trying to limit the authority of the students and emphasizes the powers of the president; but it will take time to overcome these excesses of the revolutionary period. It has become almost impossible to dismiss any teacher, particularly if he is "progressive" in politics. A fellow-traveler, no matter how poor or inefficient as a teacher, can never be dismissed, for then the charge is made that this is done on political grounds, and some universities have found themselves in serious trouble over this.

Little study has been done since liberation. First came the days of processions, dances, demonstrations. Now the attitude is that book work, essays and examinations are feudalistic and of no value for serving the people. Students spend their time in political discussion and propaganda; they are learning nothing, and a post-liberation degree is valueless. "Democratic examinations" have become popular, in which the student himself suggests the mark he thinks he ought to get, and then the whole class votes on the marks to be given to each student. Another method is the group system where a group of students work together, select the best one to take the examination, and his mark becomes the mark for all.

The 13 Christian universities have been told they can continue so long as they conform to the educational policy of the government. But their future prospects are not bright. They all depend to a greater or lesser degree on students' fees, and the people who sent their children to Christian universities can no longer afford to pay fees.

The educational policy of the New Democracy is an ambitious program to change the thoughts of 450 million people. It is meeting with no resistance. China's intellectuals are swallowing the whole propaganda line, for the only alternative is martyrdom and they are not the stuff of which martyrs are made. "Thought control" is more severe than it was under the Kuomintang, yet all make a pretense of rejoicing in their present freedom—freedom to extol the Communist Party.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROMANCE AND MR. BABBITT

by Gerald W. Johnson

IT IS BLOOD-CURDLING even to imagine the rage of Sinclair Lewis if anyone had intimated to him that his basic philosophy was drawn from *A Child's Garden of Verses*. Yet in the opening chapter of *Babbitt*, describing early morning in Zenith when Mr. Babbitt rose, showered, shaved, dressed, breakfasted and drove to his office, taking a childish and innocent pride in the deftness with which he parked his Buick in a narrow space, there is a passage describing what else had happened in Zenith during the night just past—birth, death, triumph, calamity, high tragedy, and crashing melodrama when a drab, full of cocaine, drew a pistol from her handbag and casually shot her lover across the table. All this was unknown to Mr. Babbitt and would not have interested him much if it had been known. What interested him was the skill with which he parked his car.

Mr. Babbitt was, on the whole, an unhappy man and the insertion of this passage is an intimation of why he was unhappy. He was bored, and he was bored because he didn't know what was going on right under his nose. Without benefit of rhyme, Lewis was reasserting:

> The world is so full of a number of things,
> I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings.

Probably he would never have said "happy," but he would have said "interested," which is as close an approach to happiness as a realist is likely to make. Lewis was a crusader against dullness and an assault upon dullness is the significance of Stevenson's couplet.

Lewis turned out 21 books—sufficient evidence that he wrote a lot of bilge. A man who wrote 21 masterpieces would be four or five ahead of William Shakespeare. But *Main Street*, *Babbitt*, *Arrowsmith*, *Elmer Gantry* and *Dodsworth* were social documents with a definite effect upon public opinion at the time; and they are likely to remain a permanent part of the social history of the United States. A man who has produced five novels that really meant something to his own generation is an extraordinary man indeed, one sure to be remembered for a long time.

The craftsmanship of these books is a matter of interest mainly to professors of English literature and to aspiring novelists. Lewis observed exactly, reported accurately, and checked, rechecked, compared and verified with the diligence of the dreariest German pedant who ever pursued a subjunctive through nine centuries and 900 volumes. But this was part of the mechanics of his trade. He worked hard. He worked harder than most of us can even conceive of working. But it wasn't industry that won him the Nobel prize. It wasn't industry that made him master of the American imagination for a decade or so.

The magic was an eloquence that arose from a source deeper than syntax and the rules of prosody. Because everyone recognized his own thoughts and his own words in the pages of Sinclair Lewis he was dubbed a realist, and some quirk of the literary mind holds that to be the antithesis of romanticist. But the terms are not exclusive. *Tom Sawyer* was realism. *David Harum* was realism. *Main Street* reported the idiosyncrasies of Gopher Prairie no more faithfully than those two books recorded the quirks and oddities of Missouri and upstate New York. But because they are placid and good-humored we list them in a different category.

Lewis was unhappy, and was indignant because he was unhappy. His indignation betrays his essential romanticism. If he had been a realist of the stripe of, say, Montaigne, he might have been just as unhappy, but he would not have been indignant about it, because he would have realized that happiness is impossible anyhow. But this admission is a psychological impossibility to a 100-percent American like Lewis. In the oldest state document issued by us as a nation we committed ourselves to "the pursuit of happiness," and pursue it we must, or repudiate our birthright.

Lewis proclaimed—and piled up mountains of evidence to prove—that Americans are unhappy largely by their own fault. Their stupidity renders them incapable of seeing in which direction true happiness lies. Their cowardice renders them incapable of grasping happiness when it is within their reach. Their blind greed sends them chasing after some will-o'-the-wisp that leads them into the mire. All this the average American must admit is very true. There was nothing in the assertion that came into collision with his most profound conviction, so he accepted Lewis as a prophet—of the order of Jeremiah, no doubt, but a prophet.

For he never fell into the heresy of denying that happiness exists *in posse*. On the contrary, in *Arrowsmith* he portrayed its attainment. Young Dr. Arrowsmith went after it the hard way, to be sure, and the happiness of discovering what makes a man's liver do what it does is a stern, austere form of happiness that does not

---

Gerald W. Johnson, newspaperman, historian and critic, is the author, among other books, of "Incredible Tale: The Odyssey of the Average American in the Last Half-Century."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeal to many of us. Nevertheless, it is conceivable; and even a Babbitt will readily grant that the happiness of a scientific mind is not necessarily that of a realtor. The point is that by the exercise of indomitable will power Arrowsmith pursued happiness and eventually overtook it. In the assumption that this is possible the book is American to the core.

This was the essence of the literary revolt of the twenties, of which Sinclair Lewis was one of the great chiefs. The whole crew denounced Americans furiously, and the public loved it, to the amazement of those who overlooked the fact that Americans were being denounced, but not the American ideal. We were, in fact, unhappy, and to be told that it was our own fault was quite bearable; what would have been unbearable was to be told that there is no happiness, and that pursuit of it is utterly vain. If we are unhappy because we are stupid and blind, then to develop intelligence and vision is a way out—difficult, indeed, and a faint hope, but nevertheless possible and a hope.

In that they did not proclaim the impossibility and deny the hope the writers of the twenties remained well within the line of American literary tradition. Their thunderous assaults upon the frauds and imbecilities, the hypocrisies and quackeries of their time were reformist, not revolutionary; and the mood of America has been reformist most of the time since its beginning.

Where Sinclair Lewis will eventually stand in the hierarchy of American letters is not for this generation to decide, but there is no doubt that *Main Street*, *Babbitt* and, I think, *Arrowsmith* will survive, if only as *genre* pictures. It is my own belief that future generations will find in them a good deal more, but that may be a prejudiced view because I believe that the American philosophy of life is going to have a long run. We are not ready for quietism. We still believe that when something is wrong, something can be done about it; and a raucous voice bawling out the wrong is not yet to us mere sound and fury, but a trumpet blast summoning the mighty men of valor to stand to their arms.

THE PRESIDENT'S POWER

by Edward S. Corwin

WHEN IN 1800 President Adams signed a deed conveying property to his "great and good friend" the Queen of Portugal for a legation in the Federal City, he was informed by his Attorney General that only Congress had the constitutional power to dispose of public property. When, 140 years later, President Franklin Roosevelt handed over 50 naval units to Great Britain in return for leases of some West Atlantic naval bases, he was told by his Attorney General, now a member of the Supreme Court, that he was entirely within his rights, that his power to *dispose* the forces of the United States included the power to dispose *of* them. These two episodes stand at either end of a course of constitutional development, practical and polemical, which ascribes to the President a truly royal prerogative in the field of foreign relations, and does so without indicating any correlative legal or constitutional control to which he is answerable.

Indeed, our high-flying prerogative men appear to resent the very idea that the only possible source of such control, Congress to wit, has any effective power in the premises at all. Thus when Mr. Taft in his speech of January 5 asserted that President Truman "had no authority to commit American troops to Korea without consulting Congress and without Congressional approval," and that he "has no power to agree to send American troops to fight in Europe in a war between members of the Atlantic Pact and Soviet Russia," one of the aforesaid high prerogative spokesmen declared that "his [Taft's] statements are demonstrably irresponsible. The public "is entitled to know what provisions of the law or of the Constitution have been violated by President Truman in sending troops overseas. From the day that President Jefferson ordered Commodore Dale and two-thirds of the American Navy into the Mediterranean to repel the Barbary pirates, American Presidents have repeatedly committed American armed forces abroad without prior Congressional consultation or approval." [1]

The proffered demonstration is inconclusive at best. Jefferson, in reporting his action to Congress, explained that he had been careful to authorize only self-defensive measures on the part of our forces, and that when they had captured one of the pirate vessels they had, after disabling it for committing further hostilities, liberated it with its crew. He wished, he said, to have Congress, who "exclusively" had the power, to consider whether it would not be well to authorize measures of offense. Hamilton expressed great contempt for Jefferson's scruples, but that does not alter the record to which appeal has been made.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, noted authority on constitutional law and author of many works in this field, taught at Princeton for 40 years and has been professor emeritus of jurisprudence since 1946. He has also held several posts in the federal government, chiefly in the Department of Justice.

[1] Arthur Schlesinger Jr. in the New York *Times*, Jan. 9, 1951.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to the cases in which "American Presidents have repeatedly committed armed forces abroad" without "Congressional consultation or approval," the vast majority involved fights with pirates, landings of small naval contingents on barbarous or semi-barbarous coasts, the dispatch of small bodies of troops to chase bandits or cattle rustlers across the Mexican border, and the like. Except for Polk's deliberate precipitation of war with Mexico in 1846 and a few cases occurring in the Caribbean area since 1902, they exhibit a uniform pattern of measures undertaken for the protection of American lives and property against impending or actual violence or for punishment of such violence. Such episodes are small compared with Truman's claim of power to put an indefinite number of troops in Europe for an indefinite time in anticipation of war, without consulting Congress.[2]

The power of Congress over the employment of the armed forces was repeatedly recognized in early legislation. The President's power to call forth the militia stems immediately from the Act of February 28, 1795; and I should like to inform Professor Commager [3] that it was this act and not the Constitution which "the magisterial story" was construing in the case of Martin vs. Mott (12 *Wheat.* 19; 1827); also, the President's power to employ the armed forces to suppress insurrections and enforce the law rests on the Act of March 8, 1807. Formal declarations of war by Congress have always included a clause "authorizing" and "directing" the employment of the forces to support the declaration, and it may be remembered that the Conscription Act of September, 1940, specifically provided that the forces to be conscripted would not be sent abroad without the consent of Congress. When we were precipitated into the war by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, this consent was given. It is also pertinent to recall that when President Wilson landed troops at Vera Cruz on April 21, 1914, he consulted Congress, which approved his action the following day; and President Franklin Roosevelt's "utmost sympathy" message to France, June 14, 1940, contained the caveat that "these statements carry no implication of military commitments. Only Congress can make such commitments."

Besides, the Constitution does not consist primarily of precedents but of principles with which precedents, to be valid, must be squared. The Administration's interpretation of the precedents which illustrate routine activities of the Executive departments upsets the most fundamental principle of the Constitution, the balance between the departments. It distorts the Constitution.

[2] On this paragraph see James Grafton Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution.*

[3] See his article in the New York *Times* Magazine section, Jan. 14, 1951.

The fact that a certain power is ascribable to the President does not prove that Congress possesses no power whereby Presidential employment of it may be brought under control and direction. This precise question was involved in the case of Little vs. Barreme (2 *Cr.* 170, 177; 1804). There Chief Justice Marshall, speaking with reference to the seizure of a vessel under the Act of February 9, 1809, suspending intercourse with France, said:

> It is by no means clear that the President of the United States whose high duty it is to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and who is Commander-in-Chief of the armies and navies of the United States, might not, without any special authority for that purpose, in the then existing state of things, have empowered the officers commanding the armed vessels of the United States, to seize and send into port for adjudication, American vessels which were forfeited by being engaged in this illicit commerce.

The court held, nevertheless, that since Congress had acted in the matter the President was bound to follow its directions and that the seizure had been illegal.

While the shadowy line that separates Congressional power when raising an army and creating a navy or air force to specify the purposes for which they may be employed and the President's right to dispose the forces thus brought into existence has come to be drawn in the course of the years inside what was once deemed to be legislative domain, yet there are conceded to be other powers of Congress which are constitutionally unlimited and Congress' use of which is capable of upsetting the Presidential applecart at any time. Congress can refuse to raise armies and navies at all, to borrow money, to levy taxes, to make appropriations. It can abrogate "so far as the people and authorities of the United States are concerned" any treaty to which the United States is a party, and has repealed a considerable number in whole or in part. (La Abro Silver Mining Co. *v.* US, 175 *US* 423, 460, [1899], citing cases.)

What then is the answer? Futile and embittered debate between the holders of powers that must be exercised in close co-operation if at all, or a decent consultation and accommodation of views between the two departments of government concerned? And surely, it is paradoxical in the extreme to reduce the legislative organ of government to the level of a mere rubber stamp of policies the professed purpose of which is the preservation of free institutions. Either the Brussels Agreement should be formally submitted to the Senate for approval by a constitutional two-thirds majority, or something akin to Coudert's resolution should be adopted. Our foreign policy has been elaborated in a political, and at times an intellectual, vacuum long enough.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIRGINIA'S BLACK JUSTICE

by Marvin Caplan

ON JANUARY 8, 1949, seven young Negroes of Martinsville, Va., waylaid a 32-year-old white woman, as she came up the railroad tracks from an errand in the colored part of town, and raped her. With this classic Southern crime, the case of the "Martinsville seven" began.

The seven young men were soon caught. All of them signed confessions. In April, 1949, they were brought before the Circuit Court in Martinsville. Seven white attorneys were assigned as their counsel. Six white juries were empanelled to judge them. The request of their lawyers for a change in the place of trial was denied by the court.

Beginning on April 22, the men were tried on six almost successive days. After the fourth trial day, presiding Judge Whittle remarked to a Negro lawyer that the juries seemed bloodthirsty to him; he hoped some of the boys would get life. All of them got death. In May, the seven men: Joe Henry Hampton, 20; Frank Hairston Jr., 18; Booker T. Millner, 20; Howard Hairston, 19; Francis Desales Grayson, 35; John Clabon Taylor, 22, and James Luther Hairston, 20, were taken to the State Penitentiary at Richmond and put in the death block.

The violence of the crime and the swiftness and the severity of the punishments brought the case to national and even international attention. During the two years since the crime, a series of appeals and split-second stays of execution have kept the men alive. The court actions have also raised serious questions about the even-handedness of justice in Southern courts.

When the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People first appealed the case, it did so on eight counts charging errors in procedure and trial. In a city as small as Martinsville (pop. 16,356), the defense felt, public opinion and newspaper opinion had had prejudicial effects upon the juries. The swiftness of the trials, the NAACP maintained, tended to blur the differences between defendants so that even two who claimed they had been too drunk to consummate a relationship were doomed along with the others. And, the defense charged, the death penalty for rape in Virginia was reserved for Negroes.

The NAACP carried its plea for a writ of error first to the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals and then to the US Supreme Court. Both refused to set aside the Martinsville trial. But almost the day before the scheduled execution, the NAACP obtained another stay by filing for a writ of habeas corpus in Richmond's Hustings Court. This time the defense's plea was based upon a single point: "We contend," they told the court, "the death penalty is reserved and preserved for Negroes who rape white women."

The NAACP attorneys reviewed the history of rape laws in Virginia. Prior to 1865, they pointed out, Virginia rape laws provided a 10- to 20-year sentence for white men and a sentence of 5 to 20 years to death for colored men. After the Civil War, in order to conform to the Fourteenth Amendment, the racial distinction was abolished. But the consolidated law, the defense charged, is still administered in the same discriminatory fashion. In proof, they cited the records on rape cases in Virginia since 1908 when records at the State Penitentiary were first available. During those years 1,081 Negroes were sentenced to death: 86 percent were imprisoned for 5 to 25 years; and of the remaining 14 percent, 34 Negroes were sentenced for 25 to 99 years, 57 were given life, 45 were executed. In the same period, 92 percent of the white men tried for rape were given sentences of less than 25 years, and no white man died for rape.

Judge M. Ray Doubles of the Hustings Court, in denying the writ of habeas corpus, had a more temperate objection to the plea:

> If the principle contended for by the petitioners were to be established by judicial decision, it would mean that in every trial of a Negro for rape the trial judge would have to do one of two things, *viz.*, either omit from the instruction on punishment any reference to the death penalty or set aside verdicts which fixed the penalty at death. This would result, of course, in partial repeal of a statute admittedly fair on its face.

The State Supreme Court of Appeals refused to grant a writ of error. The NAACP thereupon took the case up to the US Supreme Court again and that body, on January 2, declined to review the case even on its new basis.

The "Martinsville seven" are scheduled to die on February 2 and 5. Denied relief in the state courts, the attorneys are planning to carry the case into the lower federal courts and expect to enter a new plea for a habeas corpus writ in the Federal District Court of Richmond. And local church and citizen groups that feel the figures on rape cases show a clear bias are planning to renew their appeals for clemency.

Marvin Caplan is former managing editor of the "Southern Jewish Outlook" and is now a free-lance writer specializing in Virginia politics, the Southern labor movement and civil rights. He has written for the Richmond "Times-Dispatch," "The Crisis," and the Norfolk "Journal & Guide."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Twenty-second Amendment Lags*

THE PEOPLE of the United States still have the unrestricted right to choose their own President. The plot seriously to limit that right did not get very far in 1949. The legislatures of only two states, North and South Dakota, voted to ratify the proposed Twenty-second Amendment to the Constitution which would hold future Presidents to two terms. This amounted to a decided dragging of the feet against the bald and sinister attempt to stampede the people into curtailing their own precious political power.

After the Congress passed the resolution proposing the Twenty-second Amendment in March of 1947, an eruptive campaign of publicity was put on by the "hate Roosevelt" press and such liberty-loving "Constitution savers" as the National Association of Manufacturers, Frank E. Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government and various political nondescripts whose patriotic ambition was to enhance their own political power and financial well-being. At all costs the Constitution must be saved from itself and the mistake corrected for which the careless founding fathers were responsible. As might have been expected, the unselfish and freedom-loving Hearst, McCormick, Howard and Frank E. Gannett strings of newspapers strained in every column to protect the political liberty of the people by whittling away that liberty. To be sure, those wise men who drafted our federal Constitution judiciously left it to the people themselves to determine, subject to a check every four years, how long they should keep one man as their President. The people signified unmistakably in 1936, 1940 and 1944 that Franklin D. Roosevelt, originally selected by them in 1932, was the man whom they wanted.

During 1947, the no-third-term amendment got off to a good start. It was ratified by the legislatures of 18 states. In 1948, three more followed suit. But the best that the "saviours of the Constitution" could do in 1949 was, like the mountain, "to conceive and bring forth a mouse" in the two Dakotas. Louisiana followed suit in 1950, making 24 states that have ratified an amendment which proponents insisted was necessary to prevent the creation of an American royal dynasty of absolute power with a "crown prince" who by right of descent would succeed to the throne upon the death or abdication of the reigning sovereign. An equal number have not ratified.

There will be more legislatures in session this year than there were in 1950, so that we may again expect to have our ear drums assailed by the agonizing skirling of the Hearst and McCormick clans whipping up their courage for another raid across the border of truth and veracity and high public purpose. Twenty-three legislatures assemble this year, but 22 of these had a previous opportunity to ratify the amendment and thought so little of it that they neglected to do so. While the number of states that have voted in favor of the amendment reaches to within two-thirds of the number required, the pace toward ratification has been greatly slackened. This is probably due to the recognition of the fact that, despite the triple re-election of President Roosevelt, our democracy has lost nothing of its potency. The people re-elected Roosevelt for a fourth term because they wanted him, and they wanted him because they were witnesses to the effectiveness of his democratic leadership and recognized their need of him.

The people know that Roosevelt left our democratic processes stronger than he found them. They have come to realize how poisonously deceptive were the hysterical shrieks of the reactionary press, the fascist-minded and the underground "America firsters." They have learned that the "saviours" of our constitutional processes were merely bellwethers for those who would bend the Constitution in the direction of their own selfish interests. These "saviours" had a personal, as well as a common, ax to grind. Now the people can look back and realize that the attempt to stampede them into adopting the proposed Twenty-second Amendment was a sinister plot on the part of anti-social agencies to frighten them into mutilating their own precious democracy to the advantage of those who have always exploited the people and always will.

In order for the proposed amendment to be added to the Constitution as an abridgement of the power of the people to elect their own President, 13 more states must approve before March of 1954. Otherwise, the decoy amendment will fall as flat on its face as it deserves. Considering that the pace toward ratification at present might be properly designated a "pause," it is to be doubted that the people can now be fooled by a renewed "stop thief" campaign. They realize how precious is the power given to them by the Constitution to elect their President. They will insist upon retaining that power. They know that the greatest protection of their liberties is the power bequeathed to them by the founding fathers to select their own President freely and for as many terms as, in their judgment, will be for the common welfare.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE DETERMINED OPTIMISM OF BARBARA WARD

by Albert Z. Carr

BARBARA WARD'S wide-scoped new book is addressed to the West, but is plainly directed at the American mind. It describes the Gordian knot of the world crisis, strand by strand, and concludes that we may still manage to untie it without use of the sword. Making allowance for her British bent, Miss Ward's views do not differ materially from those of Secretary Acheson. "The present policy of containment [of Communism]," she says with determined optimism, "offers a chance and hope of peace." Nevertheless, the facts she adduces are so black, the program she urges so difficult of attainment, that the reader is likely to finish the book in a state of informed discouragement.

POLICY FOR THE WEST, by Barbara Ward (Norton; $3.75).

For example, she devotes a chapter to the tremendous importance of preventing inflation. She tells us, probably with truth, that "in nothing so much as the combating of inflation do the moral qualities of a people appear." To the American, ruefully contemplating our current spiral of rising prices and the depreciation of the dollar, it can only appear that we are failing in the first requirement. Eloquently she sets down the reasons why rigorous taxation and conscientious management of the economy are essential to the strength of the West and to the hope of peace. But who is sanguine enough, in the face of recent news from Washington, to expect Congress to heed merely rational arguments? Miss Ward herself, writing of our need for full-employment practices, can find nothing better to say than that their adoption "is not entirely inconceivable." She appears to be counting heavily on our national latencies of good sense, but there is little time left in which to tap them.

It is natural that Miss Ward, a Keynesian economist with vast knowledge of the techniques and mechanics of government, should pin her faith largely on government planning. Her prescription for peace through strength relies especially on the enlightened internationalism of the United States. She would like to see an Atlantic Council of Ministers, which would have under its control not only the diplomacy and military power of the West, but also production, resources and economic-development programs.

This recommendation is certainly aligned to the thinking of some in our Department of State, but it is far removed from the likelihood of early practice. Far from leading the nation forward on the path of internationalism, the Administration must now fight desperately to hold its present position against the revived isolationism of Messrs. Hoover and Taft. At a time when no substitute has yet been provided for the soon-to-expire Marshall Plan, and when the Point Four Program has emerged pitiably dwarfed from the womb of Congress, there is not much prospect of a new and greater surge of the international spirit. Miss Ward is too polite to write her fears of our folly, but she is of course aware that reckless assertions of partisan power-hunger and corporate interest have repeatedly wrecked the hopes of America's higher statesmanship.

The approach of *Policy for the West* is not entirely economic. Miss Ward recognizes that even sound policy could not in itself bring enduring victory to the West unless it were coupled with persuasive ideology. "If one thing is certain from the long history of man," she writes, "it is that a crusading faith [Communism] cannot be defeated save by a faith equal to its own."

No one would challenge her feeling that an inspired political creed could be more potent for our cause than armies. But here again one encounters a painful gap between goal and actuality. What flaming creed can the West now offer to the world? Miss Ward speaks of freedom, but she knows that freedom in the Western sense does not have much meaning for peoples who are urgently seeking a measure of elementary security; and so she calls for something more. The nations of the West are to shake off their "collective selfishness" and to use their resources for the common good of free peoples everywhere. In this spirit, she urges "a fifty year development program for the free peoples of Asia." The response of Congress, were such a proposal to come before it, hardly bears thinking about. If the survival of Western civilization truly depends on the altruism or even on the selfish enlightenment of our dominant politicians, our chances are not bright. Should we succeed in avoiding world war and the early fulfillment of Spengler's dark prophecies, it is more likely to be because of the compulsion of events than because of our wisdom and goodness.

One wishes that a book with so many excellences had deeper roots in history. Miss Ward is convinced that Soviet hostility toward the West reflects an essential diabolism in the Communist regime, as shown by events since 1945. But anyone familiar with the conflict of England and Russia in the nineteenth century must realize that it presaged the present struggle for power between empire fulfilled and empire emergent. Kipling's story, "The Man Who Was," suggests the extent to which Russian hostility to the West, and Russian faith in a titanic destiny, had begun to burgeon long before the days of Lenin and Stalin.

Miss Ward similarly shrugs away the Allied intervention in Russia after World War I, and much subsequent history, when she emphatically assures us that the West "cannot take any blame"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for Soviet hostility. While there can be no doubt of the immorality and ruthlessness of the Communist tyranny, the meting out of blame is always a hazardous historical enterprise. She is on safer ground when she dissects the cunning policy of the Soviets and shows how it operates against us. This she does brilliantly. But it is doubtful that her program for overcoming the Soviet threat without war will be embraced by the American nation in its present posture.

Albert Z. Carr is the author of several books in the field of history and political science, including "Juggernaut: The Path of Dictatorship" and the recent "Truman, Stalin and Peace." He was assistant to Donald Nelson on the War Production Board and served on the staffs of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency and the White House.

JAPAN'S LOST REVOLUTION

THE BEGINNINGS OF POLITICAL DEMOCRACY IN JAPAN, by Nobutaka Ike (Johns Hopkins Press; $3.50).

THE MOVEMENT for political democracy in Japan did not begin with the Allied Occupation. There were earlier home-grown efforts, and Nobutaka Ike's book is a historical analysis, splendidly done, of the origins, development and ultimate failure of the most important of these.

This was the "movement for liberty and popular rights," active in the two decades following the overthrow of the Shogunate. Beginning as a revolt of rural industrialists (who were also landlords) against the restrictions imposed on industry and trade by the Tokugawa regime, the movement developed after the Restoration of 1868 into an organized opposition against the Meiji government. The conflict was at bottom an economic policy, for the government sought to support a vast program of modernization by the maximum taxation of agriculture—the only considerable source of wealth at hand. But it soon developed into a struggle against the nature of Japan's new political institutions as well. The clique around the throne wished to perpetuate its control and safeguard its policy through the absolute power of the Emperor and the fiction of his personal rule. The opposition, in an effort to force the bureaucracy to share power and policy-making with the propertied class, demanded a parliamentary government and civil liberties. These demands were pressed by appeals to public opinion and backed by party organization on a national scale. So formidable did the movement seem in the early eighties that government leaders feared the nation was on the eve of drastic and tumultuous changes that might endanger even the throne.

The alarm was genuine enough, but exaggerated. When the government combined police measures with a show of concession, the collapse of the opposition was sudden and complete. The party organization was disbanded; important leaders deserted to the government; and the others generally settled down to winning influence under the existing regime. As time passed, they found an increasing number of occasions to give critical support to men and policies they had recently professed to abhor. Thus a great reconciliation was effected, leaving some areas of friction between the government and erstwhile liberals, but none that called into question the Emperor as the unique source of political authority.

Despite all its early promise, the democratic movement ended with this swift and inglorious denouement because Japanese society provided an inhospitable environment to its growth. The political tradition was hostile; inevitably, where family interests tended to come before political principle (particularly a new one) and official appointment was the accepted road to wealth and power, its leaders were incorrigible opportunists and office-seekers; and when its chief supporters were committed to exploiting land under conditions that did not differ substantially from those of the feudal period, fatal limits were necessarily placed on the meaning of democracy within the movement itself.

It remains to be seen whether these and other conditions of a similar order that blocked the growth of democracy in Japan in the past have now been substantially and permanently altered by the Allied Occupation. No one who has read Mr. Ike's book is likely to underestimate either the difficulty or the importance of such changes, or to take the recent striking innovations in Japan's political structure as an infallible index of progress toward democracy.

THOMAS C. SMITH

Thomas C. Smith was a Japanese-language officer with the Marine Corps in the war and served twice, in 1945 and 1949, with the Army of Occupation. He is an assistant professor of History at Stanford University.

HENRY GREEN

CAUGHT and CONCLUDING, by Henry Green (Viking; $3. each).

NOT MUCH of the wit and warmth that glowed from Henry Green's *Loving* and *Back* can be found in *Caught*. A partial explanation may lie in the fact that it was published in England in 1943 and must therefore have been written during or immediately after his enlistment in London's Auxiliary Fire Service. The experience had not been allowed to simmer and settle and the book is consequently raw and shapeless, observed with a bitter eye and told in a querulous tone.

What plot there is flows from the proximities of a disparate group of men —professional firemen and the amateurs they are training—working together under difficult conditions. Through most of the novel there has been no bombing and the men mill through endless hours of time, uncomfortably clothed, in dreary quarters, restless and bewildered. Few friendships develop and those that do are practical, symbiotic relationships. The men gossip and plot against each other and enmities flare up quickly whenever an ego is threatened or some one pushes too hard in the battle to protect his position or struggle to a better one. There is no man who really cares about another or learns anything from his life with the others. Deeds observed or words heard are censored through each man's private mass of prejudices and fears so that there is no enlightenment in any act or statement; it simply becomes a further link in the twisted chain of misunderstandings.

The depressing mood of *Caught* stems not only from the general atmosphere of bewilderment and suspicion but also from the main character, Richard Roe, who (as his name might indicate) is no character at all. He is rather the embodiment of two attitudes, a sad aimlessness

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a mild contempt for the poorer, dirtier citizen of London.

It may be that Green's purpose is to show that heroism can be expected from the most imperfect human sources, since he does try to make restitution by describing heroic fire-fighting toward the end of the book. But that section is so clearly an appendage, tacked on as hastily recorded recollections, separate in time and mood from the bulk of the book, that the total picture is not that of a group of men capable of saving London (Green says they did), but of a heap of small, unpleasant animals clawing at one another in a tight cage.

The essential loneliness of each man's orbit, the desperate measures needed and used by man to protect his fragile vanity and the odd results which flash out as misunderstandings strike on each other, are also the subjects of *Concluding*. Here again each character walks in the narrow circle of his own needs and misconceptions, and misunderstandings grow wide and wild, but the drab, muffled colors of *Caught* have been replaced by a much richer palette. Since the situations in *Concluding* are not topical and certainly not autobiographical, Green seems to have had the calm for lighter variations on his themes.

On a beautiful summer's day, two girls disappear from a state training school. One girl reappears within a few hours but will not reveal where she has been. This very lack of information gives rise to a rich melange of misinformation compounded of conjecture and lies, of someone's need for self-protection, another's desire to appear knowing, and various echoes of private woes and resentments. As these threads are woven through one another, additional strands of high color are brought in: the machinations of an old man to keep his cottage and protect his slightly demented and endearing granddaughter, the trials of her fatuous little lover, the pathetic crises in the lives of the headmistresses who keep fighting for their right to be always right, and the ceaseless darting and whispering of the lovely, evil and innocent girls who adorn and scent the fabric of the novel.

Concluding hasn't an important subject; a summer's day in the lives of a few obscure people is hardly monumental. Nor does Green have too much to tell us about present-day England except for a few wry remarks about bureaucratic processes. What is important, though, is the understanding and skill with which he creates dazzling kaleidoscopic designs of events and personalities as they join, separate and rejoin in different combinations, giving off brilliant flashes of insight as they shift. The style is as fluid and variable as the changing moods demand, ranging from bare, dry phrases to subtle cadences; and the descriptions of sunlight in thick woods and the flight of birds and of young girls, have the music and sharp imagery which add to a fine novel the luster of poetry.

KATE SIMON

MUSIC: Israel Philharmonic

ISRAEL is probably the only nation in the world in which music is a necessity to a large portion of the people. Musicians returning from Israel tell of the extraordinary warmth with which the public received them, requiring them to play concert after concert until their repertory was exhausted. In the cities, cab-drivers attend symphony concerts and exchange critical opinions with their fares; on the collective farms, the people of the commune declare a holiday when Isaac Stern or Jennie Tourel ventures over the rough roads to play or sing for them. For most members of the older generation Hebrew is a new language and the customs of Israel are new customs. Music is a common denominator for men and women of varied national and social backgrounds, a universally intelligible language to those for whom Hebrew is still a halting effort.

The musical life of Israel centers upon the Israel Philharmonic, which was founded in 1936 by the violinist Bronislaw Hubermann and launched with a series of concerts conducted by Arturo Toscanini. At first its future was precarious. The government could afford only a small subsidy, and since there was no permanent conductor, discipline was poor. But the players—more than a

Personal freedom and national security—

CAN WE HAVE BOTH ?

***ALAN BARTH*, editorial writer of the *Washington Post*, says YES!**

"With great insight and honesty Mr. Barth has shown in this important book what are the true roots of loyalty. He has performed an equally significant service in analyzing the post-war government loyalty program to show how it can endanger the true allegiance of free men." —MARQUIS CHILDS

"A first-rate book." —FRANCIS BIDDLE

"A work of the first importance; one which is indispensable reading for all Americans concerned with their freedom." —ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR., *Saturday Review of Literature*

THE Loyalty OF FREE MEN

With a Foreword by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard Law School

$3.00 at all booksellers • THE VIKING PRESS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dozen of whom were former concertmasters of pre-Nazi German orchestras —and the public wanted the orchestra to survive, and in spite of obstacles it developed rapidly. From the United States and elsewhere capable conductors came at small fees for a month or two at a time, to help bring the ensemble up to international standards. Among them were Leonard Bernstein, Izler Solomon, Nicolai Malko, Paul Paray and, after his retirement from the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Serge Koussevitzky. Celebrated instrumentalists from abroad appeared with the orchestra. Public enthusiasm made it necessary for each program to be played nine times in the three principal cities—Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jerusalem.

The American Fund for Israel Institutions, now celebrating its tenth anniversary with a campaign for $1,946,810, has been helping the orchestra to make ends meet. Two years ago, plans were laid for an American tour, to stimulate interest here through first-hand acquaintance. Paray, the Parisian *chef d'orchestre* who then held the title of permanent conductor in Israel, was slated to take charge of the concerts. When Koussevitzky made his first visit to Israel, however, he was stirred to such excitement by what he saw and heard that he offered to undertake the artistic direction of the tour. Koussevitzky's sponsorship was so valuable a box-office asset that the offer was accepted—much to the displeasure of Paray, who understandably resigned and returned to his post with the Concerts Colonne in Paris. Meanwhile Koussevitzky arranged to share the American concerts with his two chief Tanglewood pupils and protegés, Bernstein and the Brazilian, Eleazar de Carvalho.

Early this month the orchestra arrived for a tour of the United States and Canada that will take it, under the management of Sol Hurok, to 40 cities for 55 concerts. Its first two appearances were private affairs — at a political amenity in Washington and at a $100-a-plate dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York, from which the American Fund raised more than $200,000. After its first public concert, in Newark, the orchestra moved into Carnegie Hall for two programs. Koussevitzky conducted the first one and Bernstein the second. Capacity audiences attended at a $7.20 top, and applauded ardently.

From the commercial viewpoint, the success of the tour is assured by the participation of Koussevitzky and Bernstein. As a cultural mission, however, the project approaches absolute meaninglessness. After making the token gesture of playing a single movement wrenched from a symphony by the Israeli composer Ben-Haim, Koussevitzky devoted the evening to two of his most overworked war-horses, Prokofiev's Fifth Symphony and Tchaikovsky's Fourth. Bernstein played no Israeli music at all, replacing the Viola Concerto by Odeon Partos announced in the printed program by, of all things, a Mexican piece — Carlos Chavez's Sinfonia India—which he sandwiched between Mozart's Linz Symphony and Schumann's Second. I have no right to an opinion about Koussevitzky's motivation since I did not attend his concert, but I can bear witness that Bernstein obviously envisaged the occasion as another opportunity to make a killing for himself.

We heard, in Bernstein's concert, an essentially European group of sober, conservative players trying to jump through hoops to give a crackling, high-speed performance of the typically American order that is despised even by cultivated American audiences. What the character of the orchestra might be when it plays at home under less commercialized conductors, we were unable to guess. Our understanding of Israeli musical attitudes and tastes and our acquaintance with Israeli music were advanced not a whit. When the orchestra plays under Carvalho, who has never been to Israel and who is as frenzied as Bernstein without being as gifted technically, the nonsense will be complete.

The whole affair is a serious miscalculation on the part of both the orchestra management and the American Fund, no matter how great the financial gains. There was no need to bring an orchestra all the way from Israel to publicize Koussevitzky and Bernstein. In New York, if nowhere else, amends can be made: Let the orchestra play, on its way back to Israel, a program containing Israeli music, presented for the sake of the music and not for the sake of the conductor. The American Fund promised "a manifestation of the cultural achievements of the people of Israel." It should keep its promise.

CECIL SMITH

MOVIES

Magnificent Humbug

THE DAY is bound to come when Hollywood will decide to attempt the biography of Albert Einstein (probably with Sam Jaffe in the title role), and perhaps at that point it will occur to the policy makers out there that not all great men lend themselves gracefully to what the movies call a "treatment." Meanwhile, we are confronted with "The Magnificent Yankee," a purported biography of Oliver Wendell Holmes. The picture, directed by John Sturges from a text adapted by Emmet Lavery from his own successful play, is a pleasant though moistly sentimental tribute to marital compatibility, in which Louis Calhern grows old along with Ann Harding and never lets a spring go by without bringing her the first crocus found blossoming in Rock Creek Park. At one point in the film he coins the phrase "clear and present danger" and toward the end he gets off the felicitous remark that pretty girls make him wish he were 80 again. The doleful croakings of Henry Adams plague him for 30 years; Louis Brandeis and Owen Wister are his staunch friends for a like period and some 30 brilliant graduates of the Harvard Law School become his secretarial "sons," a comfort to him since he has none of his own.

All this is presented with quantities of genteel capering and quizzical falsetto in the widely-admired Calhern style. The taste, the gentle humor, the stalwart faith in democracy of the picture are alike admirable. But where is Holmes the jurist, the Great Dissenter, the Supreme Court judge who so dominated American law for decades that it is impossible to remember that he was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never Chief Justice? The awkwardness of such a man as Holmes from Hollywood's viewpoint is that he lived too long and earned his place in history with his brain. To cover in an hour and a half the ground from 1902 (when Holmes was already 61) to 1932 (when he was 90) the director must resort to the stop-action photography employed in botanical documentaries. Every time we see Calhern and Miss Harding, their hair has become a shade whiter, their movements a degree shakier, their voices noticeably more tremulous; they wither before our eyes. And every time Holmes sits down at his desk to carry on the work that made him immortal, some trivia must be dangled to divert him. The spectacle of a man thinking is a dramatic absurdity, so Holmes on the screen must be given the attention span of a chipmunk. He may have been a bit of a codger and a bit of a sport, but surely he didn't squander his years entirely on Victorian gallantries and sententious preachments to the young.

Admirably cast and superbly deployed, Lewis Milestone's current Technicolor battle spectacle, "The Halls of Montezuma," was distributed at an awkward moment. Combat pictures are one of three things: pacifist demonstrations of the horror of war, vainglorious toasts to military prowess, or romantic entertainments akin to the Westerns and crook dramas. In the face of the news from Korea, Milestone's tale of how the Marines defeated the Japanese on one of the larger Pacific Islands cannot successfully be any of these, but the director has tried to solve the problem by slanting the movie so that it is a little of all of them. "The Halls of Montezuma," starring Richard Widmark, documents honestly and honorably the physical and mental torments of war; it states editorially (in a posthumous letter left by one of its heroes) that America must arm to the teeth and it employs all the artifices of tricky scenario writing (by Michael Blankfort) to turn a case history of war into a heart-thumping story of valor and comradeship. The result is a picture that seems to say that war is unendurable and we must get ready for more of it; that no one should be asked to bear such degrading torment, and that it is an experience no one should miss. The fact that this is an accurate reflection of a good many public and private minds today makes the theme no less confusing and irritating.

The best of the new British pictures is "The Blue Lamp," a tribute to the London police force. It is a pleasantly sentimental but apparently accurate account of life behind the scenes of a local precinct station, combined with a gangster murder story entirely American in its neurotic violence. The picture makes the point that since the war a new kind of criminal has appeared in the British underworld. He is young, inexpert at his trade, irresponsible and cruel. The older thieves will have no truck with him and the police, unarmed except for a billy, are easy targets for his gun. As such a would-be mobster, Dirk Bogarde turns in a fine performance; he is frightening and sickening and an embarrassing reflection of a Hollywood killer. Jack Warner and Jimmy Hanley, leading representatives of the police in "The Blue Lamp," look, talk and brilliantly walk like all the London constables who ever directed you to Westminster Abbey or dragged you from under a bus driving on the left side of the street.

In "Operation Disaster," the stiff upper lip is opposed to the quivering lower jaw and these two theatrically effective facial mannerisms are handled admirably by John Mills and Richard Attenborough, two masters at their respective trades. Mills is the perfectly disciplined commander of a wrecked submarine resting on the bottom of the North Sea; Attenborough is a member of his crew suffering inconveniently from claustrophobia. It is a routine picture of enforced submersion, but carried out with the minute observation of detail and the aplomb that give British films their attractive flavor. I only wish the script had not affected to be so surprised to discover that when men are about to die together they become less conscious of rank and more tolerant of accents.

ROBERT HATCH

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 H ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

BLUEBERRY JAM

Made from the finest cultivated blueberries and pure sugar—cooked in small batches in gleaming copper kettles—a real home-made delicacy. Unsurpassed for taste and freshness—makes a wonderful gift. 1 Box—Six 11-oz. Jars Pure Blueberry Jam—$3.75. Shipped prepaid anywhere in U. S. but add 25¢ west of the Mississippi. No COD's please. If not satisfied, money back immediately. Send your order now.

BLUEBERRY HILL PLANTATION
Dept. NR-127, RR-2, Paw Paw, Michigan

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

ANALYSIS BY MAIL $2.00. Available for lectures, parties. Recognized graphologist. **Dorothy Sara, 11 E. 32nd St., N.Y.C.**

HOME ATMOSPHERE

My daughter, a fine, intelligent girl of twenty, neat in habits and well-mannered, musically inclined and well-read, is undergoing analysis in New York. I am anxious to have her live with an understanding couple who can provide her with a good home, some moderate supervision and sympathetic guidance. I will be pleased to exchange references. Please write to Box 15, The New Republic.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 8501, Radio City, New York.

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. **Alin, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.**

LITERARY SERVICE

SONNET DERIVES FROM "SOUND". Send one dollar for a syllabic "sounding" of your poem. It may be better than you think! Expert criticism from one poet to another. Markets suggested. Edward Miller, Apt. 1-A, 45 West 84th St., N.Y.C. 24.

ORANGES GRAPEFRUIT

JOIN WITH DISCRIMINATING NEW YORKERS who enjoy our INDIAN RIVER oranges and grapefruit! Grand for eating, juice, gifts. Guaranteed. Express prepaid. Bushel $6.00, half bushel $4.00. **James H. Hart, Island Groves, R. 2, Cocoa, Florida.**

PUBLIC RELATIONS COUNSEL

Public Relations in the Nation's Capital; a full range of services including counsel, surveys and research, promotion and publicity. **Charles Alldredge, Kellogg Bldg., Washington 4, D. C.**

TYPING

MANUSCRIPT typing, theses, medical articles, specifications. Speed, intelligence, economy. **AMBASSADOR OFFICE SERVICE, 17 East 48th Street, New York. Plaza 5-1127.**

Classified Rates

Per word, once 12¢
Per word 6 times 11¢
Per word 13 times 10¢

NEW REPUBLIC

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Lend me a hand"
FIGHT INFANTILE PARALYSIS
JOIN the MARCH OF DIMES
THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS
FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT FOUNDER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED